



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

IS INTROSPECTION INDIVIDUAL OR SOCIAL, WITHIN OR WITHOUT?

By W. D. WALLIS, University of California

When Mr. McDougall assures us¹ that all psychology is built up on analogy with the psychologist's mind, he provides no means for ascertaining whether our individual psychology happens to represent that of a normal individual. His method would give us not a psychology, but psychologies as numerous and erratic as individual minds. The ideal that rests anywhere rests nowhere.

Mr. McDougall's scientific spirit shows that he means other than he says, and that by the individual mind with which he starts he means a mind of a certain type. Indeed, he himself admits this. "Before we can give an adequate account of the individual," he says, "we must be able to describe in general terms the innate basis of the mind, in so far as it is common to all men."

If this be the key to the situation, it is the type which is important, the individual mind being of value as the basis for a psychology only in so far as it conforms to this type. If this be admitted it follows that introspection is of value, not for its uniqueness, but because it expresses conformity to a type of mind external to the introspector. He must, first of all, ascertain whether his own mind is normal; and this he cannot do unless he have already the norm by which his own mind is to be standardised. Without a common norm psychologists will scarcely find a fulcrum for their aggregate efforts or reason to hope for harmony in procedures and results, beyond the consolation that pure chance may favor their ardent efforts—a coincidence so wonderful that it could be regarded only as a law not yet understood.

How can introspection give us type of mind, seeing that such introspection is but a way of finding out whether we are of the posited type? To be valid it must be controlled by a logic from without, the logic that we apply to other minds and they, in turn, apply to us.

A priori, we have no more assurance of our own mentality than of the mentality of another; self and own mind are correlatives implying other and other minds. Even the search for our own mentality implies a mentality other than that of the searcher.

An uncontrolled introspection can be nothing else than haphazard and resultless. The introspective error can be corrected only when the within is correlated with the without. Until introspection is removed from the realm of unique individual insight and made part of an inclusive system of external tests we have no accepted criterion, no uniform method. We must think into ourselves, not look into ourselves. A looking which is not a thinking provides no corrective for its illusions. If we apply an objective test, the unique advantage which an individual has with regard to his own experience is supplemented with an opportunity to view himself as would an outsider, and to apply a rigid standard over and above the elastic introspective analysis. After all, it is

¹ Psychology (Home University Library). He is following orthodox psychology.

the outside world that leads a man to a knowledge of his self rather than a knowledge of his self that gives him a grip upon the outside world.

If his mentality be part of an integral interrelated system, analysis might begin at any part of the system and proceed to any other part of it; for if the self is given meaning by reason of the world the world is given meaning by reason of the self.

The society of which the individual is a part even in his introspective moments is not far to seek. So far as he succeeds in taking the position of an outsider and in objectifying his mental content he makes of himself an observer and of his self as observed a society; for observer and observed have no meaning unless there is some third mind for which both may be object of observation.

The external social world is part of this larger self and claimant for the ascendancy. To it every personality must give heed. But not in the same way. For this social world, too, may be objectified. Once objectified it may claim the ascendancy, or it may be subordinated to some purpose higher than the social, to a purpose comprising both the social and the individual. The external social world must, first of all be inherited, in order to play its rôle. It must be accepted and affirmed by the individual in order that he may respond to its beck and call. In order to be an external world of compulsion the world without must become part of the world within. And once it has been placed within it may be reorientated in the individual's system of values and transformed in the light of his purposes. The outside world is part of the individual if he is really a part of it.